UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/675,688	09/29/2000	Ashraf A. Michail	MS1-675US	1484

22801   7590   10/30/2007
LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER
STORK, KYLE R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/675,688	MICHAIL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kyle R. Stork	2178	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _06 September 2007_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213..

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-6, 23-28 and 36-41_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-6, 23-28 and 36-41_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _9.6.07_

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This non-final office action is in response to the Request for Continued

Examination filed 6 September 2007 and the amendment filed 3 July 2007.

2.   Claims 1-6, 23-28, and 36-41 are pending. Claims 1, 23, and 36 are

independent claims.

The rejection of claims 1-6, 23-28, and 36-41 under 35 USC 102(b) over

Simpson (Mastering WordPerfect® 5.1 & 5.2 For Windows™, 1993) has been

withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Information Disclosure Statement

3.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 6 September 2007 is in

compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the examiner is

considering the information disclosure statement.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-6, 23-28, and 36-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Simpson (Mastering WordPerfect® 5.1 & 5.2 For Windows™, 1993)

and further in view of Moody et al. (US 5890177, patented 30 March 1999, hereafter

Moody).

As per independent claim 1, Simpson discloses in an extensible electronic

document editor, a selection services component comprising a selection services

interface that provides one or more methods to enable an editor extension to override a

selection function provided by the electronic document editor and provide a customized

model for the selection function (pages 512, 514, and 517-518: Here a user overrides

an existing macro provided by the electronic document editor by overwriting the pre-

existing macro), and to clear, add or remove a segment from a selection object using

the customized model for the selection function (pages 517-518 and 520: Here, a user

is able to edit a macro by clearing the macro and overwriting or by adding/removing a

segment from the macro).

Simpson fails to specifically disclose:

A designer extensibility mechanism

A plurality of designers, wherein the designers communicate with the electronic

document editor through the designer extensibility mechanism and through the selection

services component

A designer registry including respective entries for the designers, wherein the

entries are arranged in sequential order

An event routing controller adapted to route events to at least one of the designers based at least in part on the sequential order of the entries in the designer registry

However, Moody discloses

A designer extensibility mechanism (Figure 2; column 4, lines 20-63)

A plurality of designers, wherein the designers communicate with the electronic document editor through the designer extensibility mechanism and through the selection services component (Figure 2; column 4, lines 20-63)

A designer registry including respective entries for the designers, wherein the entries are arranged in sequential order (Figure 2; column 4, lines 20-63)

An event routing controller adapted to route events to at least one of the designers based at least in part on the sequential order of the entries in the designer registry (Figure 2; column 4, lines 20-63: Here, a plurality of users are able to make edits and suggestions to a document created by an original creator. The original creator receives these modified documents and comments. The original creator is first in the sequential order, as he/she created the document. All modifications are returned to the original creator).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Moody with Simpson, since it would have more easily allowed for peer editing of a document (Moody: column 4, lines 20-63).

As per dependent claim 2, Simpson discloses wherein one of the methods provided further comprises a method that adds an element to an editable selection (pages 517-518 and 520).

As per dependent claim 3, Simpson discloses wherein the selection services interface is adapted to enable the extensible electronic document editor to interact with the customized selection model without exposing details of the editor extension (page 516-517: Here, when a macro is executed, the user does not see the actually keystrokes/coding of the macro. Instead the user merely has the resulting document).

As per dependent claim 4, Simpson discloses wherein one of the methods further comprises a method that adds a segment to an editable selection (pages 523-525: Here, a user is able to edit the text of the macro similarly to editing a text document).

As per dependent claim 5, Simpson discloses wherein one of the methods further comprises a method that removes a segment from an editable selection (pages 523-525).

As per dependent claim 6, Simpson discloses wherein one of the methods further comprises a method that sets a selection type (pages 526-535: Here, macros can be of a plurality of types, including automatic execution, automatic execution at start-up, and nested).

As per independent claims 23, Simpson discloses a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for one or more interfaces that, when executed by an extensible electronic document editor on a computer, perform the following steps:

- Override a selection function provided by the electronic document editor to provide a customized model for the selection function (pages 512, 514, and 517-518)

- Receive parameters from a designer through a selection services interface (pages 512-513: Here, the creation of a macro enters parameters from a designer through a selection services interface)

- Utilize the parameters to clear, add, or remove a selected segment from a selection object of an electronic document using the customized model for the selection function (pages 517-518 and 520)

- Return values to the designer regarding the state of the selected segment (pages 514-515: Here, a designer recording a macro is presented with a macro definition that has recorded all the keystrokes while creating the macro)

Simpson fails to specifically disclose:

A designer extensibility mechanism

A plurality of designers, wherein the designers communicate with the electronic document editor through the designer extensibility mechanism and through the selection services component

A designer registry including respective entries for the designers, wherein the entries are arranged in sequential order

An event routing controller adapted to route events to at least one of the designers based at least in part on the sequential order of the entries in the designer registry

However, Moody discloses

A designer extensibility mechanism (Figure 2; column 4, lines 20-63)

A plurality of designers, wherein the designers communicate with the electronic

document editor through the designer extensibility mechanism and through the selection

services component (Figure 2; column 4, lines 20-63)

A designer registry including respective entries for the designers, wherein the

entries are arranged in sequential order (Figure 2; column 4, lines 20-63)

An event routing controller adapted to route events to at least one of the

designers based at least in part on the sequential order of the entries in the designer

registry (Figure 2; column 4, lines 20-63: Here, a plurality of users are able to make

edits and suggestions to a document created by an original creator. The original creator

receives these modified documents and comments. The original creator is first in the

sequential order, as he/she created the document. All modifications are returned to the

original creator).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention to have combined Moody with Simpson, since it would have more

easily allowed for peer editing of a document (Moody: column 4, lines 20-63).

As per dependent claims 24-28, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to

those in claims 2-6 respectively. Claims 24-28 are similarly rejected.

As per independent claim 36, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to

those in claims 1 and 23. Claim 36 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 37-41, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to

those in claims 2-6 respectively. Claims 37-41 are similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6, 23-28, and 36-41 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Kyle R. Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-

4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kyle R Stork
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

krs

STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER